

Friday, April 12th 1991

Today's Topics:

Question From A Ufology Sig User - Help

Re: Bill Cooper

(none)

UFOLOGIST PASSED OVER

solar flares

National Reconnaissance Office

solar flares

Re: Rick redux

Re: Skeptics

Re: Openmindedness and psy

Re: Rick redux

Re: Statements of accepta

Re: HUMAN VISITORS

From: John.Burke@f9.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG (John Burke)

Subject: Question From A Ufology Sig User - Help

Date: 10 Apr 91 07:23:00 GMT

* Forwarded from "ParaNet UFO"

* Originally from John Burke

* Originally dated 04-10-91 0:05

Dale:

Here's my 2 cents' worth:

>

> 2. What is/was Project Redlight and Project Snowbird?

>

> I know that you guys know this one.

Project Snowbird was supposed to involve the testing of crashed UFOs or UFOs given to us by the aliens. Many people believe that the Cash-Landrum incident occurred as a result of Project Snowbird. I used to have a copy of Bill Moore's FOIA file on Project Redlight which he sells for about \$6. I think that it was supposed to have a similar focus, such as the reverse-engineering of captured UFOs.

> 3. Does the 'National Reconnaissance Organization' still

> exist, and what

> can they tell us about UFO activities?

>

> I never heard of it, have you?

The NRO is supposed to be part of the NSA. Some believe that their duties involve crash/retrieval operations. Many suspect that the infamous "Black

Helicopters" are flown by the NRO. As I recall, it is supposedly headquartered down in Texas somewhere.

>
> 6. This is a long one. How can the assassination of
> President Kennedy/MJ-
> 12/The Council of Foreign Relations/The Joint Alien,
> U.S., U.S.S.R/The
> Deaths and or disappearance of prominate civilian and
> military people
> and the manned base on the moon connect?
>
> Hey, this question has all the makings of a book!!!

In fact, Bill Cooper has written just such a book. He calls it: Behold A Pale Horse. I call it: Behold A Pail Of Horsesh*t.

-- John

--

John Burke - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Burke@f9.n1012.z9.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Greenen)
Subject: Re: Bill Cooper
Date: 9 Apr 91 14:20:00 GMT

* Replying to a message originally to Don Ecker
TM> > > much information in or your brain will pop out"
TM> > > concept.
TM> > > Our mind supposedly has unlimited storage capacity.
TM> >
TM> > Yea Tyson, that may be, but still, that does not mean that
TM> > you don't question, and research. Do you believe EVERYTHING
TM> > you hear? If so, I got this really GREAT car that I am
TM> > selling, and BOY* * * can YOU BUY it CHEAP. You send me a
TM> > check, I send you the papers-----OK?
TM>
TM> Well, I never stated that you disbelieve everything you
TM> hear.. I was just trying to point out the danger in using
TM> the "mind so open the brains flutter out" concept.. It
TM> gives an excuse to ignore possible information. I sound
TM> too serious sometimes, and I apologize if I seemed too
TM> vehement in my post.
TM>
TM> My point isn't that you should believe or disbelieve
TM> anything. My point is that you should consider all sources

TM> of information.. and if there is not sufficient (or
TM> reasonable) proof to disbelieve it, then it shouldn't be
TM> dismissed totally. However, there are some claims that do
TM> not have to be researched into, for they seem to be a waste
TM> of time (like the aliens are "demons" type). I agree with
TM> you totally on that. I also never lead myself to believe
TM> any
TM> information if I do not have sufficient proof of it also..
TM> I just
TM> consider it, and try to learn more information about it,
TM> and hopefully gain more proof for or against it.

TM>

TM> Tyson

TM>

TM> --- GoldED 2.29f-

TM> * Origin: ParaNet ALPHA-EPSILON(sm) ABySS - WASHDC

TM> (1:109/134)

I agree with you 100 % on your statement. If a person was released from prison after spending 40 years for a ccrim and while walking down to the local diner to get himself some real food. If a UFO flew over his head, stopped and pick him up as in the Ed Walters case, should we throw out his testimony because he had a prison record? Should we throw out all what Bill Cooper says because he goes off the deep end sometimes? I don't think so, are courts won't let you use pass crimes in a case, then why do the ufologist have double standards. Why must we have to drag a alien space craft in the middle of Washington D.C. for some to accept that this is the only proof that they can except. Why always this double standard that we try to create. I will repeat this to all that are reading this, I know that they exist and I am not going to play this game that some like to play. I think its time to try and find out the WHO, WHAT, WHERE AND HOW. Tyson; with the logic you have, you will help find these answers that we all are seeking. 73's ---Jim---

--

Jim Greenen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Greenen)

Subject: (none)

Date: 9 Apr 91 14:43:00 GMT

What seems strange about the Kecksburg sighting is that nobody has ask the opinion of the original investigator of that case, Clark McClelland. He lives here in Central Florida and is mention in Leonard Stringfield book and also in Above Top Secret. Clark has been a active investigator in UFOs for over forty years and former NICAP director for the Space Center???? ---Jim---

--

Jim Greenen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Greenen@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Speiser)
Subject: UFOLOGIST PASSED OVER
Date: 10 Apr 91 06:18:00 GMT

UFOLOGIST DENIED PROMOTION
by Jim Speiser

ParaNet Zeta-Reticuli 04/09/91 - A Tucson man has been passed over for a promotion within the Sheriff's Department, allegedly because of his interest in UFOs.

Bob Dean, a 62-year-old technical worker within the Pima County Office of Emergency Services and an officer of the Mutual UFO Network, is suing the Department, which oversees the OES, alleging violations of discrimination laws as well as of his First Amendment rights.

Dean, who served 27 years in the US Army and retired as a Command Sergeant Major, claims that he was number two in line for a promotion, out of a list of 70 applicants, for the head job at the emergency services office. When the number one applicant declined the job, Dean says, it was incumbent upon the Department to name him, based on his professional credentials and years of service to Pima County.

But Dean was passed over, and the job went to the next in line. Dean filed a claim with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which ruled in his favor, but that ruling was overturned by the County Manager, who was supported by the Sheriff.

At first, Dean thought age was the issue - he was 61 at the time. But in a sworn, tape-recorded deposition, the Sheriff apparently raised a different objection. Dean quoted the Sheriff as saying words to the effect of, "I've known Bob for years, and know him to be very a professional and capable guy - hell, he even helped get me elected back in 1980. But I just couldn't bring myself to offer him that position. He's into UFOs, you know."

Bob Dean has quietly served in various capacities in the UFO field, including a stint on the Board of Directors of the now-defunct Aerial Phenomena Research Organization (APRO). His interest in the subject was apparently sparked by his experiences while on duty at NATO's SHAPE headquarters in Paris. Cleared for TOP SECRET-COSMIC security information, Dean claims he had access to several "sensitive" documents which he says would shine a different light on the military's interest in UFOs. He makes vague allusions to one document in particular, which he refers to as "The Assessment."

"I've been pretty quiet about this for a number of years now," says Dean, "but I'm not going to be around that much longer, and I'm tired of all the secrecy." When reminded of the similarity between his story and that of Ufology's enfant terrible, M. William Cooper, who claims to have had access to Top Secret UFO documents at the Navy's Pacific Fleet Headquarters, Dean merely scoffed. "Now there's a gentleman who's lost a lot of credibility in my book."

However, it was not unusual, Dean says, to have enlisted men and non-coms "clean up" after generals and other top brass. "There were some indiscretions, some sensitive documents left lying around."

Dean is soft-spoken, very polite and personable. While his present post as MUFON State Section Director for Pima County has made him more visible of late, he has maintained a low profile in Ufology for some years, yet unlike Cooper, who seemingly came out of nowhere, his interest in the subject has been a known factor. He is well thought-of by others in the field, including MUFON State Director Hal Starr. "As far as I can tell, Bob's a straight shooter," says Starr.

Dean's battle with his superiors will soon raise his visibility to the national level. An upcoming segment of TV's "Hard Copy" will feature the brouhaha, which Dean claims is the first "UFO employment discrimination case" ever to be litigated. Dean was interviewed by a Hard Copy reporter for "over seven hours," and there is talk that an entire half-hour episode will be devoted to the case, which may come to trial as early as this summer. Dean is asking for back pay, restoral of pension, and a large sum of money for "mental anguish."

--

Jim Speiser - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Speiser@paranet.FIDONET.ORG

From: ecn.purdue.edu!lush
Subject: solar flares
Date: 10 Apr 91 17:20:34 GMT

From: lush@ecn.purdue.edu (Gregory B Lush)

A while back, Mr. Corbin mistakenly posted some solar flare alerts to the newsletter. I asked some questions about flares, but no reply. I then went to the source of the postings in alt.space and got answers to all my questions.

If anyone else was interested, I can send you a list of our questions/answers and a glossary of terms used in the flare alerts.

Greg Lush (lush@ecn.purdue.edu)

From: ncar!shemtaia.weeg.uiowa.edu!jrblack
Subject: National Reconnaissance Office
Date: 11 Apr 91 01:25:10 GMT

From: James Roger Black <jrblack@shemtaia.weeg.uiowa.edu>

Greg Lush asked about the NRO:

- + Does the 'National Reconnaissance Organization' still exist, and what
- + can they tell us about UFO activities?

Actually, it's the 'National Reconnaissance Office', and yes it does still exist (or at least it did as recently as 1986, and I have heard nothing to indicate otherwise since then). William Burrows' book 'Deep Black' (Random House, 1986) discusses the NRO in some detail. Here is how he begins Chapter 9 of that book:

The National Reconnaissance Office, which officially does not exist, is headquartered in a guarded sanctum--4C-956--inside the Pentagon. The NRO's cover, according to a small sign on the outermost of its several doors, is that of the Office of Space Systems, which, in turn, reports to the under secretary of the Air Force for Space Systems.

The NRO's cover may be suitably ambiguous, but its mandate is explicit. It is responsible for the design, development, and procurement of all U.S. reconnaissance satellites and for their management once in orbit.

Since the NRO is in charge of spy satellites, and UFOs (if they exist) can be expected to (1) appear on satellite photos occasionally, and (2) inspect spy satellites up close and perhaps interfere with them from time to time, it is not unlikely that the NRO could have interesting stuff in their files. It isn't likely they will ever tell us, however, since--as Burrows says--NRO officially does not even exist.

One other detail of interest in Burrows' book is his reference (p. 221) to famous UFO debunker Philip J. Klass as 'a longtime observer of reconnaissance satellite activities' and quotes him as an authority on the subject. Hmmmm ...

From: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: solar flares
Date: 10 Apr 91 22:44:00 GMT

> From: ecn.purdue.edu!lush@scicom.AlphaCDC.COM
> Date: 10 Apr 91 17:20:34 GMT
> Message-ID: <11516@scicom.AlphaCDC.COM>
> Newsgroups: info.paranet
>
> From: lush@ecn.purdue.edu (Gregory B Lush)
>
>
> A while back, Mr. Corbin mistakenly posted some solar
> flare alerts to the newsletter. I asked some questions
> about flares, but no reply. I then went to the source of
> the postings in alt.space and got answers to all my questions.
>
> If anyone else was interested, I can send you a list of our
> questions/answers and a glossary of terms used in the flare
> alerts.

I would love to have it. Sorry, did I miss replying to something that you sent?

Mike

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f422.n104.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)
Subject: Re: Rick redux
Date: 8 Apr 91 17:24:43 GMT

> > In order to save echo bandwidth, I've decided to
> > change my mind and admit publicly that I'm really a closed-minded
> > zealot who's here to attack people for their beliefs, ignore
> > overwhelming evidence that might serve to undermine my faith in my
> > ideology and divert me from my hidden agenda, and basically to
> > test how dark the depths of my soul really are.
>
> Ah Ha! I knew it all along.... I bet you < GASP!! > even
> write letters to Phil < GASP > KLASS!! Out with the stake

> Mike, we got one to burn!
>
> GRIN

Wait! I repent, and have seen the light (a blue one, from the Pleiades).

Actually, my mind was damaged at an early age when my mother solemnly advised me to avoid walking through screen doors because I might _strain_ myself. I've had a hard time believing people ever since.

Best Regards,
Rick M.

--

Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)
Subject: Re: Skeptics
Date: 8 Apr 91 18:08:56 GMT

Gene --

You make some very good points about avoiding circular reasoning in considering the ET (and other) UFO hypothesis, which leads some to refuse to consider any evidence. Like all such refusals to consider evidence, this is counter-productive and bull-headed. I of course agree, and appreciate your comments.

Best Regards,
Rick M.

--

Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)
Subject: Re: Openmindedness and psy
Date: 8 Apr 91 20:11:47 GMT

gatech!apple.com!well!ddrasin (Dan Drasin) writes:

DD> Rick, I've heard variations on this from skeptics for a long
DD> time. It's usually '...as long as your mind isn't so open
DD> that your brains fall out.' Pray tell, Rick, just what does
DD> this mean?

It means that some people use "openmindedness" as a code word to mean unwillingness to apply one's critical faculties to claims of fact, at all. A couple of examples will suffice, I think: When Uri Geller informed Targ and Puthoff that he was receiving his information from orbiting flying saucers from the planet Hoova, a lot of folks decided not to take Uri very seriously any more (and began to have doubts about Targ and Puthoff), without much worry about being "closed-minded". When others heard Shirley MacLaine tell friends that they are only figments of her imagination, they reacted similarly.

In short, it means that -- although the boundary between sense and nonsense may be hazy and legitimate grounds for many differences of opinion -- nonetheless it exists. There are a few people who violently disagree with even this_. To these folks, who basically consider reality to be only a crutch, I say: More power to you. Hail Eris! All hail Discordia!

> Just exactly what are the prescribed limits to openmindedness,
> and who gets to do the prescribing for everyone else?

I'll leave that up to you, for now, but I have your number.

> This falls into the same category as the statement 'extraordinary
> claims require extraordinary proof' -- because (apart from the
> double-standard implied here, which science is never supposed to
> tolerate) nobody has ever defined what 'ordinary' (and therefore
> "extra-ordinary") means.

God, I've gone over this so many times. Old chestnuts refuse to die.

The basic idea is supposed to be that all factual claims are supported by some evidence (zero or greater), and that some are supported by huge amounts of evidence accumulated over hundreds of years. I should hasten to add that quality counts, too. Some bodies of evidence are more convincing than others. (For some guidelines as to what is good scientific evidence and what is bulldata, I refer you the FidoNet SCIENCE echo or any sci.* newsgroup. That is clearly beyond the scope of this echo, and a too-long discussion, to boot.)

A claim is extraordinary if its acceptance would require rejecting massive amounts of well- (if tentatively) accepted, accumulated knowledge. This happened, for example, when geologists suddenly accepted plate tectonics in the early '60s, when the quantity and quality of evidence for tectonics became convincing -- after 45 years. It has never happened, for example, with Charles Fort's hollow-earth theories, since that evidence is, um, unconvincing.

This is -=not=- a double-standard, since it is just a corollary of the

maxim that all claims should be supported by appropriate evidence.
(The preponderance of quantity and quality rules.)

> That statement is also frequently used to discourage honest
> research into certain subjects....

For the record, as I have said here many, many times, I'm all in
favour of honest research, regardless of subject.

> In other words, a (real or imagined) lack of proof is often
> used to rationalize avoiding the very investigation that would
> be required to develop such proof in the first place.

For the record, I'm against imagining a lack of proof.
For the record, I'm against rationalising.
For the record, I'm all in favour of investigations.

> If anything, 'extraordinary' claims (assuming one is interested
> enough to follow them up in the first place) require extraordinarily
> openminded, careful and resourceful science....

For the record, I'm absolutely keen on open-minded, careful, and
resourceful science.

> ...Period.

Period, as long as one realises that any very surprising result, whose
acceptance would require massive revisions in accepted scientific
knowledge, will need to have strong evidence. This is the ordinary
standard of science, and applies equally to Alfred Wegener, father of
plate tectonics, and to Robert Jahn of the Princeton PK experiments.
No more, no less.

Some people just won't accept that standard (Velikovsky, Reich...).
That's fine, but then what they do isn't science.

If this topic continues, it would better be moved to a more
appropriate echo or newsgroup.

Best Regards,
Rick M.

--

Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)

Subject: Re: Rick redux
Date: 8 Apr 91 20:14:59 GMT

> Well, thank God you finally brought that out into the open!<grin>.
> I've been reading the ongoing battle between all of you people and it
> just occurred to me that it seems a shame that, Heaven forbid anyone
> should have an actual opinion about something. Everyone seems afraid
> of giving their gut feelings on a subject in fear of "offending" the
> other party, with the exception of you to a degree. I mean, I'll come
> right out and say it, I THINK BILL COOPER IS A COMPLETE FRAUD AND
> APPEARS TO HAVE SERIOUS NEUROTIC PROBLEMS TO BOOT, AND YET I CONSIDER
> MYSELF QUITE OPENMINDED ON THE SUBJECT OF UFOS! ...

John --

Personally, I've met too many totally sincere people to apply the word "fraud" to an individual without a tremendous amount of thought. Also, questioning people's motives is seldom necessary, or even helpful. You come across as having an axe to grind, and lose the chance to let the record speak for itself. Lastly, as I said when I tut-tutted and tsk-tsked Don for calling Cooper a "charlatan", such words can land you in court.

Nonetheless, I thank you for your remarks. You're right; we shouldn't be afraid to express opinions. I've just had a tough time with oversensitive and aggressive correspondents, and have to worry about being misunderstood. For the record, I think some of Coop's statements are highly suspect, and I understand why many serious UFOlogists are more than annoyed with him (most recently Budd Hopkins in MUFON's journal). I basically just don't care to debate Cooper with people.

Best Regards,
Rick M.

--

Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Rick Moen)
Subject: Re: Statements of accepta
Date: 8 Apr 91 20:21:49 GMT

Jim --

> The good [text files] should be presented so that they may be acted
> on, and the bad ones, so that they may stand as examples of how NOT
> to think. I suspect that if Rick kept the files up because he damn
> well felt like it, this may be WHY he damn well felt like it.

Thank you. That's pretty much the real reason (and it's never been an issue in these parts). It's just that whenever people start grandstanding to me about how sysops should run their boards (as opposed to making suggestions), I simply tell them to go hang. Sysops get a continual parade of such folk, and I have little patience for them.

I have less patience when the grandstanding is just another ploy in a tiresome smear campaign, and none at all when that campaign has extended (notwithstanding allegations to the contrary) over a two year period in the FidoNet SCIENCE, PHYSICS, and UFO conferences -- and now here, too.

Again, notwithstanding allegations to the contrary, I advocated sysops' classifying download files as "Sysop's Picks" or other only as a less drastic alternative to deleting Cooper's files.

Once more, notwithstanding allegations to the contrary, I am not a "member" of CSICOP. I serve on its Electronic Communications Subcommittee, offering it advice and help in that area, and do not presume to speak for it. (To find out CSICOP's views, contact CSICOP.) I do speak for Bay Area Skeptics, however.

My occasional and long-time correspondant John Tender has, however, suggested (in a roundabout way) a useful project: Writing to Klass, Oberg, Sheaffer, other members of CSICOP's UFO Subcommittee, and to other prominent UFologists, and ask them formally what they would accept as convincing evidence of the ET UFO hypothesis. (Allegations to the contrary, I never stated that Klass, Oberg, and Sheaffer had published such statements, only that they had "said" what would convince them. They may have published this; I don't remember.) Perhaps someone else in ParaNet could do this -- I'm swamped.

In my opinion, any skeptic who considers himself an authority on UFology (which I've consistently said I'm not, remember) should be able to provide a clear -- and serious -- answer to that question. For that matter, so should any other avowedly serious UFologist.

> I **believe** Klass is looking for some kind of statement from a body
> such as the National Academy of Sciences...

The Betelgeusian Academy of Sciences? <grin>

I think Phil Klass can probably specify a little better than that. Fortunately, he's not at all difficult to reach. You can tell him that Moen is stirring up trouble again.

Best Regards,
Rick M.

--

Rick Moen - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name

INTERNET: Rick.Moen@f27.n125.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Pete.Porro@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Pete Porro)
Subject: Re: HUMAN VISITORS
Date: 9 Apr 91 16:31:00 GMT

As far as why do "visitors" have similar features. I have a few answers. One is that what we see is controlled to a large extent by our previous context and perceptions. Since it appears that not too many people have had good close up views, it might be fair in my opinion to say that they are describing what they see in terms of what reality we know. It's difficult to describe something to someone when they have no concept of what it is you are trying to create a visual image of for their mind.

Second point is that certain physical features are logical for advancement and abilities. Opposing thumbs for grasping (no comment on how many fingers though) Two eyes for parallax vision. Two ears for binaural hearing. Method of ingesting nutrition, (once again may not include a mouth and teeth like ours). Method of communication, verbal and written. Mobility, a capacity for intelligence. I think you get the idea I am heading towards. The logic in my viewpoint is that beings with six arms, two heads and 8 eyes are less likely than something _similar_ in nature to the human form. I'm in no way trying to say that it is impossible for another intelligent life form to have all of the above different, it just makes more sense physically to have a like construction.

Last of all, even if there is a high probability that there is life elsewhere, why presume they/it is visiting us at all?

--

Pete Porro - via FidoNet node 1:104/422
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Pete.Porro@f414.n154.z1.FIDONET.ORG

*****To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to*****
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP {ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com
ADMIN Address infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com
{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

*****The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter*****